

14/ Appeal  
Brief (3)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES



STANLEY B. MILLER III et al)  
Serial No. 09/768,016  
Filed January 23, 2001  
ACID-GAS ABSORBING TABLET  
AND METHOD OF USE

Art Unit 1615

Examiner Susan T. Tran

RECEIVED  
JUN 05 2003  
TECH CENTER 1600/2003  
Best 6-11-03

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF**

Appellants hereby appeal from the final rejection dated December 30, 2002 from the Examiner.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real parties in interest are Multisorb Technologies, Inc. and Donaldson Company, Inc.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related appeals and interferences.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 3-7, 10-12 and 19-48 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 13-18 have been canceled. Claims 3-7, 10-12 and 19-46 are being appealed. Claims (47) and (48) are being withdrawn from appeal.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

There were no amendments filed subsequent to final rejection. However, there were two interviews with the Examiner after final rejection, and Interview Summary records were filed by both the Examiner and the attorney of record.

## SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The invention defined by the claims is a gas-absorbing tablet for absorbing deleterious acid gases generated in confined environments, such as computer hard drives and other types of computer and electronic devices (page 1, lines 8-14). The claims relate to the tablet itself which contains an adsorbent, a binder and two basic salts (page 6, lines 3-7). The claims also relate to the method of fabricating the tablet (page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 9). Relative to the tablet, the preferred adsorbent is carbon or silica gel or a blend thereof (page 3, lines 11-12). Other adsorbents, such as molecular sieve and cellulose materials may be used (page 3, line 22). The preferred binder is polyvinylpyrrolidinone (page 3, line 24). Any standard tableting binder may be substituted (page 3, line 27 to page 4, line 3). A preferred basic salt which is mixed with the adsorbent is potassium carbonate (page 4, line 7). Other basic salts having a pH of between about 7 and 12 may be substituted for the potassium carbonate (page 4, lines 10-14). Another basic salt which is preferably present is potassium bicarbonate (page 4, lines 23-24). Other basic salts having a pH of between 7 and 12 may be substituted for the potassium bicarbonate (page 4, line 27 to page 5, line 2). The potassium carbonate is mixed with the adsorbent and its function is to adsorb the major portion of the acid gases (page 4, lines 14-16). The potassium bicarbonate is mixed with the binder to absorb acid gases directly and thereafter

also adsorb the acid gases which have been adsorbed by the binder and thereafter desorbed therefrom (page 5, lines 2-5). The mixture of the adsorbent and one basic salt is mixed with the mixture of the binder and another basic salt, and then the combined mixture is compressed in a tablet (page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 9). The reason that potassium bicarbonate is used in addition to the potassium carbonate is because it mixes more readily with the binder (page 5, lines 6-8). The reason that potassium carbonate is preferentially used with the adsorbent is because of its greater capacity to absorb the acid gases (page 5, lines 8-10). The manner in which the tablet functions is set forth in the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 18 and ending on page 8, line 11. Summarizing the foregoing, the tablet contains a first basic salt which is primarily associated with the adsorbent because it is mixed therewith and a second basic salt which is primarily associated with the binder because it is mixed separately therewith, and the two separate mixings are then mixed together and the subject matter is pressed into a tablet.

#### **ISSUES**

(1) Whether claims 3-6 and 39-48 were properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuma et al.

(2) Whether claims 7, 10-12 and 28-37 were properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuma et al and Osborne et al US 4,855,276.

(3) While claims 3-6 and 39-48 were finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tuma et al US 6,146,446, the Examiner withdrew this rejection in the Examiner's Interview Summary of May 29, 2003.

#### **GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

Relative to the rejection of claims 3-6 and 39-46 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Tuma, independent claims 3 and 39 do not stand or fall together.

Relative to the rejection of claims 7, 10-12 and 28-37 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Tuma and Osborne, independent claims 7 and 28 do not stand or fall together.

The claims which are dependent on the above independent claims stand or fall with them.

The Examiner did not treat claim 38 in the final rejection. Claim 38 does not stand or fall with claims 3 and 39.

#### **ARGUMENT**

##### **The 35 USC 103 Rejection based on the Tuma Patent**

Claims 3-6 and 39-46 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Tuma.

It is submitted that claims 3 and 39 do not stand or fall together for the following reason. Claim 3 specifically recites "a first basic salt, a second basic salt, said first basic salt being primarily associated with said adsorbent and said second basic salt being primarily associated with said binder." Claim 39 does not stand or

fall with claim 3 because it is set forth in "means plus function" format wherein the specific functions of the "first blended mixture means" and "the second blended mixture means" have their specific functions specifically set forth, and such functions are not at all set forth in claim 3. Thus, claims 3 and 39 claim applicants' subject matter in entirely different manners.

It is submitted that claim 38 (which was not treated by the Examiner in the final rejection) does not stand or fall with claims 3 and 39 because it is directed to entirely different subject matter, namely, a first blended mixture of at least one adsorbent and a basic salt, a second blended mixture of a binder and a second basic salt, and a blended mixture of the first and second blended mixtures.

In the 35 USC 103 rejection on Tuma the Examiner stated:

"Tuma is relied upon for the reason stated above. **Tuma does not teach first acid salt being primarily associated with the adsorbent, and second acid salt being primarily associated with the binder.** However, even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. **In re Thorpe**, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Absent of showing unexpected result, **it is the position of the examiner that no criticality is seen in a particular second basic salt mixed with the binder.** Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation determine a suitable method with the expectation of at least similar result, because Tuma teaches adsorbent article for the same purpose desired by the applicant, e.g., adsorbent

article used in electronic devices to adsorb acid gas."  
(Emphasis added)

The reason "stated above" by the Examiner appears in the 35 USC 102 rejection which was withdrawn, and it reads as follows:

"Tuma teaches shaped adsorbent articles useful in electronic device (see abstract). The article comprising mixtures of adsorbent materials includes activated carbon, silica gel, calcium carbonate, potassium carbonate, potassium permanganate, calcium sulfate, and sodium carbonate; and binder includes microcrystalline cellulose, starch, sodium silicate, and polyvinylpyrrolidone (columns 5-6). The adsorbent article can be formed using compression molding or tablet-forming method (id, column 9, lines 47-62)."

Applicants have reviewed the Tuma patent and note that Tuma, in column 5, lines 10-13 specifically states:

"Suitable **adsorbent** materials include, for example, activated carbon, activated alumina, molecular sieves, silica gel, potassium permanganate, calcium carbonate, potassium carbonate, sodium carbonate, calcium sulfate, or mixtures thereof." (Emphasis added)

Tuma in column 5 specifically states at lines 29-34

"Suitable **binders** include, for example, microcrystalline cellulose, polyvinyl alcohol, starch, carboxyl methyl cellulose, polyvinylpyrrolidone, dicalcium phosphate dihydrate and sodium silicate." (Emphasis added)

In column 10, lines 2-7, Tuma gives examples of shaped articles as follows:

"Typically, the shaped adsorbent article includes 70 to 98%, by weight, adsorbent material and 2 to 30%, by weight, binder. One suitable shaped adsorbent article includes about 87%, by weight, activated carbon, about 3%, by weight, potassium carbonate, and about 10%, by weight, polyvinyl pyrrolidone."

In the foregoing specific example the Tuma patent does not disclose **an adsorbent plus a binder plus a first basic salt plus a second basic salt** in the manner set forth in claim 3 or the "means plus function" presentation as set

forth in claim 39. The most that Tuma discloses in the above-quoted example is an **adsorbent**, a **binder** and a **basic salt**.

The above-noted subject matter of column 5, lines 10-13 of the Tuma patent 6,146,446 appears in the following paragraph in column 5, lines 3-18:

"At least a portion of the material used in the shaped adsorbent article has absorbent properties. The shaped adsorbent article is often formed using **an adsorbent material and a binder**. The adsorbent material can include physisorbents and/or chemisorbents, such as desiccants (i.e., materials that adsorb or absorb water or water vapor) and/or materials that adsorb volatile organic compounds and/or acid gas. **Suitable adsorbent materials include, for example, activated carbon, activated alumina, molecular sieves, silica gel, potassium permanganate, calcium carbonate, potassium carbonate, sodium carbonate, calcium sulfate, or mixtures thereof.** The adsorbent material may adsorb one or more types of contaminants, including, for example, water, water vapor, acid gas, and volatile organic compounds. **Although the adsorbent material may be a single material, mixtures of materials are also useful.**" (Emphasis added)

It is submitted that lines 3-18 of the Tuma patent do not render the claims 3, 38 and 39 obvious. Claim 3 calls for four elements, namely, an adsorbent, a first basic salt primarily associated with the adsorbent, a binder, and a second basic salt primarily associated with the binder. The above-noted paragraph of Tuma merely states that mixtures of **adsorbent** materials may be associated with the binder and the four components recited in the claims are not obvious from the teaching in column 5, lines 3-18. In this respect, column 5, lines 3-18, include only two basic components, namely, **adsorbent materials** and a **binder**. The adsorbent materials can include desiccants, and it is specifically

stated "Suitable adsorbent materials include, for example, activated carbon, activated alumina, molecular sieves, silica gel, potassium permanganate, calcium carbonate, potassium carbonate, sodium carbonate, calcium sulfate, or mixtures thereof." This paragraph further states "Although the adsorbent material **may be a single material, mixtures of materials** are also useful." It is submitted that a plurality of the adsorbent materials recited in lines 10-13 of column 5 cannot be combined together with the binder to meet claims 3 or 38 or 39, so as to justify a 35 USC 103 rejection of obviousness. It is submitted that Tuma does not teach a combination of adsorbent materials recited in lines 10-13 which would render obvious claim 3 which recites an adsorbent, a binder, a first basic salt primarily associated with the adsorbent and a second basic salt primarily associated with the binder. The most that can be said for the foregoing portion of Tuma is that a plurality of adsorbents is combined with a binder. The four elements recited in claim 3 are not obvious in view of Tuma.

It is submitted that the materials recited in lines 10-13 do not render claim 39 obvious which recites the "first blended mixture means" and its function, the "second blended mixture means" and its function. This subject matter is not obvious from column 5, lines 10-13 of the Tuma patent.

Claim 38 recites "a first blended mixture of at least one adsorbent and a basic salt, a second blended mixture of a binder and a second basic salt, and a blended



mixture of the first and second blended mixtures." It is submitted that any hap-hazard combination of the various adsorbent materials recited in the Tuma patent at column 5, lines 10-13 does not render the limitations of claim 38 obvious.

In the above rejection the Examiner also stated "However, even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself." It is not seen where any of the above claims 3, 47 or 39 are product-by-process claims. They are strictly composition claims wherein the components of the composition are recited. Accordingly, it is not seen where the Examiner's conclusion is applicable, namely, the conclusion that "The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In the rejection, the Examiner further stated "Absent of showing unexpected result, it is the position of the examiner that no criticality is seen in a particular second basic salt mixed with the binder." In answer to this, it is submitted that the criticality is as expressed in the specification, namely, the second basic salt mixes more readily with the binder than if only one salt was mixed with the adsorbent and the binder, and the second basic salt not only absorbs the acid-gas but also absorbs the acid-gas which was adsorbed and

desorbed from the binder. It is submitted that this concept of the use of the second basic salt associated with the binder is not taught in the Tuma patent nor is there any reasonable suggestion therein a second basic salt should be primarily associated with the binder.

The Examiner further stated "Hence it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation determine a suitable method with the expectation of at least similar result, because Tuma teaches adsorbent article for the same purpose desired by the applicant, e.g., adsorbent article used in electronic devices to adsorb acid gas." The foregoing statement is fraught with inaccuracies. First of all, appellants' tablet is not an **adsorbent** article. It is an **absorbent** article because it actually absorbs acid-gases, that is, it breaks them down so that they disappear. If it adsorbed acid-gases, it would do that which the polyvinylpyrrolidinone does, namely, adsorbs and then desorbs the acid-gases. Furthermore, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to "by routine experimentation" arrive at appellants' claimed subject matter. In this respect, there is absolutely no suggestion whatsoever in the Tuma patent that the polyvinylpyrrolidinone adsorbs and then desorbs acid-gases. Thus, since there was no recognition of the problem, it is submitted that routine experimentation would not result in appellants' claimed subject matter. In this respect, it is submitted that routine experimentation

occurs when a desired objective is pursued and various procedures are performed in an attempt to obtain the desired objective. However, in this particular situation, the basic recognition of the adsorption, desorption problem with polyvinylpyrrolidinone was not recognized by Tuma. Accordingly, it is submitted that it cannot be concluded that routine experimentation even entered into the matter of showing that the claims were obvious over Tuma under 35 USC 103.

**The Rejection of Claims 7, 10-12 and 28-37  
under 35 USC 103 as Unpatentable over  
Tuma et al and Osborne et al**

First of all, it is submitted that independent claims 7 and 28 do not stand or fall together.

Claim 7 is directed to a method of absorbing acid gases from an electronic device comprising providing a gas absorbing tablet which includes a first basic salt primarily associated with an adsorbent and a second basic salt primarily associated with a binder and installing the acid-gas absorbing tablet in an electronic device.

Claim 28 does not stand or fall with claim 7 because it is directed to a method of fabricating a mixture for producing an acid-gas absorbing tablet and it includes the steps of blending an adsorbent with a first basic salt to produce a first mixture, blending a binder with a second basic salt to produce a second mixture and blending the first and second mixtures. Obviously, claim 28 differs entirely in subject matter from claim 7.

In the 35 USC 103 rejection the Examiner stated that claims 7, 10-12 and 28-37 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tuma and Osborne. In the body of the rejection the Examiner stated

"Tuma is relied upon for the reasons stated above. [The reasons given in the 35 USC 103 rejection] **Tuma is silent as to the limitation of second basic salt is associated with the binder,** however, absent showing evidence on the contrary, it is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art would by routine experimentation determine a suitable process with the expectation of at least similar result, because Tuma teaches the use of adsorbent article containing the same material, same shape, and for the same purpose, absorbing acid gas to protect electronic devices from contaminants. [Matter in brackets added.] (Emphasis added)

"The reference is silent as to the teaching of sodium or potassium bicarbonate.

"Osborne teaches adsorbent composition comprising activated carbon powder, activated alumina, water, and sodium bicarbonate (columns 5-6). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare Tuma's adsorbent article using basic salts taught by Osborne, because the references teach the advantageous results in the use of basic salts in adsorbent composition. The expected result would be an adsorbent article in a variety of shapes useful to be placed in smaller spaces, such as disk drives."

As noted above, in the rejection the Examiner stated:

**"Tuma is silent as to the limitation of second basic salt is associated with the binder,** however, absent showing evidence on the contrary, it is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art would by routine experimentation determine a suitable process with the expectation of at least similar result, because Tuma teaches the use of adsorbent article containing the same material, same shape, and for the same purpose, absorbing acid gas to protect electronic devices from contaminants." (Emphasis added)

It is submitted that one skilled in the art would not by routine experimentation arrive at the claimed subject matter.

Claim 7 recites "a first basic salt primarily associated with said adsorbent, and a second basic salt primarily associated with said binder." Claim 28 recites the method of fabricating a mixture by blending a first mixture of an adsorbent and a first basic salt, and blending a second mixture of a binder and a second basic salt, and blending the first and second mixtures. Accordingly, since there was absolutely nothing in the combined Tuma and Osborne patents of applicants' concept as to why a second basic salt is combined with the binder, as in claim 7, or why there were separate blendings of the various components of subject matter as in claim 28, it is submitted that there was no basic concept for effecting routine experimentation thereof which would result in rendering appellants' claimed subject matter obvious.

As noted above, the rejection was based on Tuma and Osborne. In this regard to Tuma the Examiner stated:

"The reference is silent as to the teaching of sodium or potassium bicarbonate."

Thereafter, the Examiner stated:

"Osborne teaches adsorbent composition comprising activated carbon powder, activated alumina, water and sodium bicarbonate (columns 5-6)."

The Examiner then concluded

"Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare Tuma's adsorbent article using basic salts taught by Osborne, because the references teach the advantageous results in the use of basic salts in adsorbent composition. The expected result would be an adsorbent article in a variety of shapes useful to be placed in smaller spaces, such as disk drives."

While Osborne discloses basic salts in an adsorbent composition, it is submitted that there is no teaching therein that one of the basic salts can be primarily associated with a binder to produce appellants' special relationship with the binder in absorbing acid-gases which have been adsorbed and desorbed from the binder of a tablet. In other words, it is submitted that there is **absolutely no motivation** in either Tuma or Osborne that a basic salt should be associated with a binder to absorb acid-gases and also absorb acid-gases which have been absorbed and desorbed from a binder.

The foregoing treated the manner in which claims 7 and 28 defined over the combined Tuma and Osborne patents. It is also submitted that there is absolutely nothing in the combined Tuma and Osborne patents which renders obvious the acid-gas absorbing tablet of claim 38 which recites the blended mixture of one adsorbent and a basic salt, a second blended mixture of a binder and a second basic salt, and a blended mixture of the first and second blended mixtures.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that the final rejection of claims 3-7, 10-12 and 19-46 be reversed.

Three copies of this brief are being submitted.

The fee of \$320 which must accompany the filing of the brief is submitted herewith. Any deficiency may be charged to Account No. 09-0450 of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

STANLEY B. MILLER III ET AL

JOSEPH P. GASTEL

By 

Attorney for Appellants

Registration No. 17,796

(716) 854-6284

FAX (716) 854-7688

Buffalo, New York 14203

May 30, 2003

JPG/rk

768016.BRF



APPENDIX - APPLN. SERIAL NO. 09/768,016

- ✓  
3. An acid-gas absorbing tablet comprising in relatively sufficient proportions by weight at least one adsorbent, a binder, a first basic salt, a second basic salt, said first basic salt being primarily associated with said adsorbent, and said second basic salt being primarily associated with said binder.
- ✓  
4. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 3 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.
- ✓  
5. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 3 wherein said first basic salt and said second basic salt are selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.
- ✓  
6. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 3 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates, and said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium bicarbonates.



✓  
7. A method of absorbing acid gases from an electronic device comprising the steps of providing an acid-gas absorbing tablet comprising in relatively sufficient proportions by weight at least one adsorbent, a binder, a first basic salt primarily associated with said adsorbent, a second basic salt primarily associated with said binder, and installing said acid-gas absorbing tablet in said electronic device.

✓  
10. A method as set forth in claim 7 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

✓  
11. A method as set forth in claim 7 wherein said first basic salt and said second basic salt are selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

✓  
12. A method as set forth in claim 7 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates, and wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium bicarbonates.

19. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 3 wherein there are present by weight said adsorbent in the amount of between about 73% and 93%, polyvinylpyrrolidinone as the binder in an amount of between 4.2% and 25.1%, potassium bicarbonate as said second basic salt in an amount of between about 0.4% and 6.7%, potassium carbonate as said first basic salt in an amount of between about 0.2% and 8.4%, and water in an amount of between 0% and 30%.

20. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 19 wherein said adsorbent is a blend of activated carbon and silica gel.

21. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 20 wherein said blend is in any proportions including total activated carbon or total silica gel.

22. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 19 wherein said adsorbent is present in an amount of between about 78% and 88%, and wherein said polyvinylpyrrolidinone is present in an amount of between about 8.3% and 16.8%, and wherein said potassium bicarbonate is present in an amount of between about 1.4% and 3.9%, and wherein said potassium carbonate is present in an amount of between about 0.8% and 4.2% and wherein said water is present in an amount of between about 0% and 15%.

23. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 22 wherein said adsorbent is a blend of activated carbon and silica gel.

24. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 23 wherein said blend is in any proportions including total activated carbon or total silica gel.

25. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 19 wherein said adsorbent is present in an amount of between about 80% and 85%, and wherein said polyvinylpyrrolidinone is present in an amount of between about 9.2% and 10.9%, and wherein said potassium bicarbonate is present in an amount of between about 2.6% and 3.1%, and wherein said potassium carbonate is present in an amount of between about 1.6% and 2.5% and wherein said water is present in an amount of between about 0% and 2%.

26. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 25 wherein said adsorbent is a blend of activated carbon and silica gel.

27. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 26 wherein said blend is in any proportions including total activated carbon or total silica gel.

28. A method of fabricating a mixture for producing an acid-gas absorbing tablet comprising the steps of providing an adsorbent and a first basic salt, blending said adsorbent and said first basic salt to produce a first mixture, providing a binder and a second basic salt, blending said binder and said second basic salt to produce a second mixture, and blending said first and second mixtures.

29. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 28 wherein said first basic salt and said second basic salt are selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

30. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 28 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates, and wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium bicarbonates.

31. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 28 wherein said adsorbent is a blend of activated carbon and silica gel.

32. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 31 wherein said first basic salt and said second basic salt are selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates

33. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 31 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates, and wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium bicarbonates.

34. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 31 wherein said blend of adsorbent is in any proportions including total activated carbon or total silica gel.

35. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 34 wherein said first basic salt and said second basic salt are selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

36. A method of fabricating a mixture as set forth in claim 34 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates, and wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium bicarbonates.

37. A method of fabricating said acid-gas absorbing tablet from the mixture set forth in claim 28 including the step of pressing said blend of said first and second mixtures into a tablet.

38. An acid-gas absorbing tablet comprising a first blended mixture of at least one adsorbent and a basic salt, a second blended mixture of a binder and a second basic salt, and a blended mixture of said first and second blended mixtures.

✓  
39. An acid-gas absorbing tablet comprising first blended mixture means for absorbing an acid-gas by converting said acid-gas into a salt and carbon dioxide and water which is adsorbed by an adsorbent therein for subsequent evaporation to the atmosphere, and second blended mixture means including a binder for binding said second blended mixture means with said first blended mixture means and for both absorbing said acid-gas by converting said acid-gas into

a salt and carbon dioxide and water which is adsorbed by said adsorbent for subsequent evaporation to the atmosphere and for converting said acid-gas which is adsorbed and desorbed from said binder into a salt and carbon dioxide and water which is adsorbed by said adsorbent for subsequent evaporation to the atmosphere.

✓  
40. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 39 wherein said first blended mixture means comprises at least one adsorbent and a first basic salt, and wherein said second blended mixture means comprises said binder and a second basic salt.

✓  
41. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 40 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

✓  
42. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 41 wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates and bicarbonates.

✓  
43. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 42 wherein said binder is polyvinylpyrrolidinone.

✓  
44. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 40 wherein said first basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates.

45. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 44 wherein said second basic salt is selected from the group consisting of sodium and potassium carbonates.

46. An acid-gas absorbing tablet as set forth in claim 45 wherein said binder is polyvinylpyrrolidinone.

768016.ApX